UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,032	01/19/2001	Gary L. Bennis	5437cp	7928

7590 01/13/2005

Carl L. Johnson
Jacobson and Johnson
Suite 285
One West Water Street
St. Paul, MO 55107-2080

EXAMINER	
ROWAN, KURT C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3643	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/766,032	BENNIS, GARY L.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kurt Rowan	3643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Nov. 15, 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *18-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *18-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ingram. The patent to Ingram shows a two stage fishing bobber in Fig. 1 having a main body 10 and a member 12 resiliently displaceable with respect to the bobber main body to a force exerted on the member as disclosed in column 2, lines 20-30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingram. The patent to Ingram shows a two stage bobber as discussed above. In reference to claim 19, Ingram does not disclose that the force to displace the member to a down position is equal to the buoyant force of the bobber main body so that when the member is in the down position, the bobber main body is submerged. However, it

would have been obvious to employ a main bobber body and a member that have substantially equal forces since routine experimentation would be used to determine the exact values of the force to displace the member to a down position and the buoyant force of the bobber main body.

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingram as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Behensky.

The patents to Ingram and Behensky show fishing bobbers. Ingram has been discussed above and does not show a spring. The patent to Behensky shows a bobber having a main body 1 and a resiliently displaceable member 10, 15 with a spring 16. In reference to claim 20, it would have been obvious to provide Ingram with a spring as shown by Behensky since merely one mechanical equivalent member is being substituted for another to hold the fishing line in the bobber main body.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed Nov. 15, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's response overcomes the rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103 to Kotis. Applicant argues that Ingram does not show or teach simultaneous submersion of the bobber main body and displacement of the member with respect to the main bobber body. However, a careful inspection of Ingram reveals that as a fish takes that bait, the stem 12 starts to descend at a gradual resistance since the force of friction between the stem 12 and the main body 10 is starting to be overcome. At the same time, since the main body and the stem are frictionally engaged, the main body

will also start to descend, but as stated in Ingram, the stem pulls free and descends first. This can be considered as a gradual descent since the stem does not displace much water. The flat base of Ingram will not require a much greater resistance to pull under the surface since a large volume of the stem is already under the water which would require a substantial force to overcome. Applicant has not submitted any evidence showing that this is an abrupt change in the force of resistance to pull the bobber under the water. Applicant should recite the structure of the bobber more precisely. The claims do not recite that the main bobber body and the member simultaneously submerge over the entire range of motion. In reference to claim 19, Applicant argues that Ingram does not show the force to displace the member to a down position is substantially equal to the buoyant force. However, it appears that if this were the case the member would be down but the main bobber would still be at the surface since at that point the forces would be equal. In response to applicant's argument that the Ingram would not be operable when modified by Behensky, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is

some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation is generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to combine the references since one can be considered as simple such as Ingram and one can be considered as complex such as Behensky. However, this argument is lacking since both references are fishing bobbers and are from the same field of endeavor. Simple and complex are not considered to be patentably limiting, but what is important is what the combination suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kurt Rowan whose telephone number is 703 308-2321. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on 703 308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kurt Rowan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3643

KR